

Information Services Board Meeting Minutes – August 8, 2002

Department of Information Services Boardroom, The Forum Building
Olympia, Washington

Members Present:

Glenn Anderson
Everett Billingslea
Emilio Cantu
Marty Daybell for Tom Kelly
Tom Fitzsimmons
Jayasri Guha
Earl Heister (via telephone)
Ed Lazowska
Stuart McKee
Laura Ruderman
Fred Stephens

Members Absent:

Lisa Brown
Mary McQueen
James West

Roll Call

A sufficient number of members were present to constitute a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the April 10, 2002 and June 13, 2002 meeting were approved.

**Information Technology
Decision Package Prioritization
process**

Peter Antolin, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Financial Management (OFM) and Stan Ditterline, Senior Technology Management Consultant, Department of Information Services (DIS) gave a presentation on the information technology decision package prioritization process. Mr. Ditterline stated that at the June ISB meeting a joint presentation was given by OFM and DIS on the criteria to be used for evaluation of decision packages. At the June meeting the Board requested follow-up discussion about the prioritization process for projects identified in the agencies' budget decision packages. A one-page overview describing the process was provided to the members; the first step will be for the individual DIS consultants to evaluate and rate the individual decision packages that are received from each of the agencies. A scoring matrix has been developed to assess the extent of benefits and collaboration, return on investment, and support of federal or state mandates. After the DIS consultants evaluate the packages, they will meet with the respective OFM budget analyst who will review the different functional areas of government such as Natural Resources, Education, and Health and Human services. The decision packages will then be prioritized using the combination of DIS

and OFM criteria within each of those functional areas. Representative Anderson asked for information on what is being spent and how agencies classify and categorize the hard and soft IT expenditures from the OFM accounting point of view. Mr. Antolin stated he would work with the OFM accounting division to provide that information. Representative Anderson also requested that the ISB receive a draft of the final document so they could have the opportunity to review and ask questions before the final version is released to the public. Mr. Antolin stated he would work with Mr. Ditterline to get a preliminary list of projects to the ISB, but asked the members to keep in mind that a lot of things can change within the last 72 hours before it goes public. Representative Ruderman stated that she would like to see a comprehensive list of projects in decreasing order of importance, regardless of funding sources.

Small Agency Information Technology Initiative

Connie Michener, Senior Policy Advisor, DIS, Peter Antolin from OFM, and Bob Bippert from the Department of General Administration gave a presentation on the small agency information technology (IT) initiative. Mr. Antolin stated that last fall it became evident that there were problems in how smaller agencies were addressing their IT needs. This was partly due to some small agencies not having the discretionary resources to invest in IT projects and equipment. In October 2001, OFM asked DIS to assess what smaller agencies are using and how they are getting IT support within their agencies. That assessment identified a need to develop strategies to assist small agencies in connecting to the state governmental network infrastructure and provide them with a secure network environment. The strategies also included: co-locating a number of small agencies in a single or multiple office park in order to take advantage of existing available resources; utilizing the larger agencies' IT support and infrastructure to assist the smaller agencies; and developing funding strategies to connect smaller agencies to the state's network. In turn, the benefits would be increased access to state services, access to Washington statewide web applications via internet or statewide intranet, shared hardware and software, and more ability to interact with other state agencies. The small agency IT initiative was originally funded from the technology pool, but the allocation was rescinded in the 2002 session. The Governor has, however, made an allocation from his emergency fund of \$55,000 to help move the program along. Mr. Bippert stated that additional reasons for co-locations include cost avoidance such as shared meeting rooms, improved facilities management, shared parking cost, physical safety, and consolidation of services.

Justice Information Committee recommendation to disband the JIC

Lourdes Collins, Senior Technology Management Consultant, DIS provided an overview of a recommendation to disband the Justice Information Committee (JIC). The JIC was created by

the ISB in 1992 to provide policy level direction. The Criminal Justice Information Act Executive Committee (CJIA) was established by legislation in 1984 and has the authority to reconstitute itself. The recommendation is to combine the two committees and include the members of the JIC in the CJIA thereby eliminating duplication of effort. Draft legislation for a new governance model has been created, and until such time the legislature approves the new model, the CJIA wishes to reconstitute itself and has the authority to do so in statute. After some discussion, Ed Lazowska made the following motion:

Information technology activities within the criminal justice system have important implications for public safety, public privacy, and other areas. Adherence to appropriate IT policies is of great importance. The ISB supports disbanding the JIC with the understanding that the role formerly played by the JIC will be assumed by the CJIA.

The motion passed unanimously.

OMNI Phase III Funding

Joe Lehman, Secretary, Department of Corrections, (DOC) provided an update on the status of Phase Two of the Offender Management Network Information (OMNI) project and requested support for funding of Phase Three. The project is currently in the second of four phases; Phase One is in production and Phase Two is under development. He stated the project is on schedule and under budget. The original Phase Three budget proposal was \$12.7 million, but actual costs have not yet been determined. Representative Ruderman asked for assurance that the project will save time so that there would not be any risks associated when the project is completed. Don Price, DOC, stated that the project has had 1,000 users involved in the design and development of the project. He also stated that a full-time customer team is a part of the project and they are providing considerable user input. A motion was made to support DOC's request to proceed with Phase Three of the OMNI project and seek Legislative funding approval. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.